

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 185 867

FI 011 410

AUTHOR Parasher, S. V.
TITLE Focus on Learners' English: A Case Study of Hindi-Speaking First Year Students' Performance.
INSTITUTION Central Inst. of English and Foreign Languages, Hyderabad (India).
PUB DATE 77
NOTE 13p.
JOURNAL CIT CIEFL Bulletin: v13 n2 p41-57 1977
EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *College Second Language Programs; *English (Second Language); *Error Analysis (Language); Grammar; Higher Education: Hindi; Language Usage; *Second Language Instruction; *Sentence Structure; Structural Analysis (Linguistics); Translation; *Verbs; Writing (Composition)
IDENTIFIERS India

ABSTRACT

Some of the errors in selected areas of English grammar and lexis made by a sample of 100 first year college students from Madhya Pradesh, India, were investigated. The errors of students are described in linguistic terms, and some of the probable sources of errors are explained. The rules of grammar and usage that should be established to help the learners overcome their learning problems are indicated. Samples of students' English were obtained through two exercises: a free composition and a passage for translation from Hindi into English. Out of 141 scripts collected from four colleges, 100 were selected for analysis. An erroneous expression is considered to be any word, phrase, or sentence which deviates from its manner of use by an educated native speaker of standard British English or violates any rule of contemporary English grammar or usage. Categories and subcategories of errors were established in terms of the rules of grammar or usage violated. In all, 4161 errors were identified and categorized under 15 major areas listed in order of frequency of recurrence. Of these, errors in the verb phrase are discussed because they form the bulk of the total errors, and it is the verb phrase which is central to sentence construction. Errors in the verb phrase are divided into three major categories: verb forms and patterns, auxiliaries, and tenses. (SW)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

Director, CIEFL

CIEFL Bulletin

XIII, No. 2 (1977) 41-57

Focus on Learners' English: A Case Study of Hindi-Speaking First Year Students' Performance¹

S. V. Parasher

Language teachers have always been concerned about the errors of their students. The traditional attitude to errors was that "all errors other than those made by native speakers are abnormalities" (Palmer, 1917: 81). But in recent years, particularly in the wake of the Chomskyan revolution in linguistics, this traditional view of learners' errors as deficiencies has given way to a more rational view. Errors are now viewed as evidence of the learner's progress towards acquiring the target language. The learner is now seen as constructing for himself a mini-grammar of the target language on the basis of the linguistic data to which he is exposed. He tries out this mini-grammar whenever he performs in the target language and produces errors. The learner's errors, therefore, give us an insight into his system at a particular stage of learning, which Nemser (1971) calls "an approximative system".

Currently, the problem of difficulty in second language learning is being approached from two points of view: contrastive analysis (CA) and error analysis (EA). The CA approach aims at predicting the areas of difficulty with reference to the interference of the mother-tongue. Language teachers have not found CA very useful because,

- i) it focusses mainly on the differences between the mother-tongue and the target language;
- ii) not all the difficulties and errors can be traced back to the influence of the mother-tongue;
- iii) some areas predicted by CA to be difficult do not pose any problems to the learner;

- iv) the theory of interference on which CA is based has been questioned; and
- v) "most of the available differential descriptions are so superficial and incomplete as to be misleading" (Mackey, 1966: 201).²

Language teachers and applied linguists have, therefore, found it more relevant to study the learner's performance in order to infer from it the nature of his competence and the processes by which it was acquired. Central to such an investigation is the analysis of errors actually made by the learner. From the insights gained from such an investigation it may be possible to adopt the teaching strategies which facilitate the process of language learning.³

In this paper I wish to report a part of the research that was undertaken to identify some of the errors in selected areas of English grammar and lexis made by a sample of hundred first year students from Madhya Pradesh, to describe the errors in linguistic terms, to explain some of the probable sources of errors and to indicate what rules of grammar and usage should be established to help the learners overcome their learning problems.⁴ The data for this study were collected from four colleges affiliated to Vikram University, Ujjain. Samples of students' English were obtained by setting them two exercises: a free composition and a passage for translation from Hindi into English. Out of 141 scripts collected from the four colleges, 100 were selected for analysis.

An erroneous expression, for purposes of this paper, is any word, phrase or sentence which deviates from its manner of use by an educated native speaker of standard British English⁵ or violates any rule of contemporary English grammar or usage. Categories and sub-categories of errors were, therefore, established in terms of the rules of grammar or usage violated. In all, 4161 errors were identified and categorised under fifteen major areas listed in order of frequency of recurrence (as shown in the Table on the opposite page).

Of these, I wish to take up errors in the verb phrase for discussion in this paper, because they form the bulk of the total errors (1479 out of 4161 i.e. 35.93 per cent) and it is the verb phrase which is central to sentence construction. Errors in the verb phrase have been divided into three major categories: verb forms and patterns, auxiliaries and tenses (See Appendix: Lists 1 to 3).

Category	No. of errors	Percentage
1. Inappropriate lexical items	689	16.55
2. Errors in the use of verb forms and patterns	620	15.27
3. Errors in tense usage	505	12.10
4. Errors in article usage	405	9.70
5. Errors in the use of prepositions	368	8.81
6. Errors in the use of auxiliaries	354	8.46
7. Errors in the use of pronominals	239	5.74
8. Omission of major constituents	216	5.16
9. Wrong subject-verb agreement	178	4.25
10. Errors in the use of plural forms	155	3.70
11. Errors in the use of modifiers	143	3.41
12. Wrong word order	124	2.95
13. Errors in responses to yes/no questions	88	2.09
14. Inappropriate conjunctions	42	1.00
15. Errors in the possessive case	35	0.83

(i) Errors in Verb Forms and Patterns

In the use of verb forms and their patterning a total of 620 errors has been recorded (List 1). Some of the typical errors made by students of English as a second language in the verbal group are: *is make, is live, are go, am play, was lived, were came, is helped, was go, was ask* and so on.⁶ These instances of overgeneralization are the effects of particular learning strategies on items in the system of English. Richards (1971) describes the strategy employed here as 'hypothesizing of false concepts'. The learners seem to have arrived at a system in which *is* and *are* function as markers of the present tense and *was* and *were* as corresponding markers of the past. This turns out to be the most productive of learner strategies and hence the source of a large proportion of errors in the verbal group. As Richards (1971: 207) points out, "certain types of teaching techniques increase the frequency of overgeneralized structures". *She makes* may be contrasted with *she is making* and *she comes* with *she will come*. After some time the learner produces *she is comes* (List 1. i) and *she will comes* (List 2. ix).

Errors in the forms of irregular verbs (List 1. x) are caused by interference from the other forms of verbs in question. Since past (-ed) and past participle (-en) forms of regular verbs are inflected alike (e.g. *talk-talked-talked*), the students hypothesize that all regular and irregular verbs have

only two forms. They use the *-en* form in place of the *-ed* form of irregular verbs probably because of their early exposure to the former. Hence, they find it difficult to distinguish between forms like *go-went-gone*, *take-took-taken* (cf. Duskova, 1969). Forms such as *speaked*, *buyed*, *drinked* (List 1. xi) are instances of developmental errors made by native children as well as second language learners as Dale (1972: 55) points out: "Children learning English use *comed*, *goed*, *breaked*, and similar forms. The irregular, or strong, verbs of English are inflected for the past tense in the same manner as the regular, or weak verbs".

Errors in the complement pattern such as *decided to spent*, *like to seeing*, *after reached home*, *interested in sing* (List 1. vi, vii, viii) are results of the pressure of one English construction on another. There is not only the confusion of the participle (past as well as present) and the infinitive, but also of the participle and the plain stem [*After (to) see the Taj*] and of the present and the past participles (*is interesting in games*). Some of these errors are due to violation of restrictions on some English verbs with regard to the type of complement they can take—infinitival or participial (*-en* or *-ing*). The same applies to the confusion between the present and the past participles. Errors like *got thrill*, *was build*, *was buy* (Table 1, ix) may be due to the learners' inability to use *-en* forms after *be* and *get*. Other errors like *we eat* (for *ate*), *the train arrive* (for *arrived*) may be due to a general tendency to use uninflected forms.

The use of *that*-complementizer in reporting questions of both *wh*- and Yes/No type (List 1. xiii) may be due to negative transfer from the mother-tongue. In Hindi the clause marker is always *ki* whether it is a reported statement or a question. *Ki* is usually translated as *that* into English. Jain (1974) points out another, and perhaps more powerful, source of this error—the teaching strategy of direct and indirect narration in our schools. Students are so rigorously drilled in exercises of the following type that *that* becomes established as the only clause marker for finite complement clauses:

Direct	Indirect
The girl said, "It is time for dinner".	The girl said <i>that</i> it was time for dinner.
The teacher tells me, "I am coming".	The teacher tells me <i>that</i> he is coming.

The error may be called 'teaching-induced', to use Stenson's (1975) phrase. The learners use *that* in combination with the generalization of NP-Aux inversion for question patterns and produce deviant structures such as

that did you go and *that why don't you go* (List 1. xiv). The retention of NP-Aux inversion in reported questions is due to overlearning of the rule governing question patterns in English.

The students need to get rid of *be* from utterances in the simple present and the simple past. They need to distinguish between the copula *be* and the auxiliary *be*. *Be* is required to carry the tense when no other lexical verb is present. When there is a lexical verb, then the verb stem or verb stem + *-s* is used to form the simple present and the verb stem + *-ed* to form the simple past.

Errors in the complement pattern can be corrected by helping the learner acquire the restrictions on verbs. For example, the verb *agree* can be followed by a *that*-clause or a *to*-infinitive:

1. He agreed to come.
2. He agreed that he would come.

but not by *-ing*:

- *3. He agreed coming.

A verb like *went* cannot take a *that*-clause;

- *1. I want that I (you) should go.

or a gerundial complement:

- *2. I want going.

Want can take an infinitival complement only.

3. I want to go.
4. I want you to go.

Whenever these verbs are taught, restrictions on their use must also be established.

The mutual interference between the infinitival and participial forms can be avoided if the following rule is established:

*The infinitival 'to' must be followed by the bare stem of the main verb.*⁷

Proper attention must be paid to help the learners acquire correct forms of reported questions.

If there is a wh-word in the question then it must be used as the clause marker. 'Yes/No' questions must be reported with 'if' or 'whether'.

In reported questions the NP-Aux inversion must be changed to the normal word order of statements.

For the past and the past-participle forms of irregular verbs the student will have to depend on rote learning and constant practice in their use. It is a good strategy to drill all the three forms whenever a new irregular verb is introduced. A good dictionary always gives a list of irregular verbs with their inflexions.

(ii) Errors in the Use of Auxiliaries

The use of auxiliaries is another trouble spot for the learners under study. In all 354 errors were recorded in the use of auxiliaries (List 2). As already pointed out in (i) above, some of the learners have come to regard *is/are* and *was/were* as the only markers of the past and the present tense in a great many contexts. They tend to extend this transitional rule to the formation of the present perfect also and produce deviant structures such as *he was studied* (for *he has studied*). In addition, they do not seem to have acquired *have* as an auxiliary verb. The omission of *be* from the progressive and the passive (List 2. ii, iii) are typical developmental errors made by learners of English as a second language (cf. Richards 1971). The use of double auxiliaries as in *is do not going*, *am don't like* and *was you did not go* (List 2. iv) may be because the students associate *do + not* with the negative. They use *is/am/are/was/will/could* as tense carriers or operators for NP-Aux inversion in questions. The omission of *do* from questions and negatives (List 2. v) is also a developmental error made by learners of English as a second language (cf. Burt and Kiparsky, 1972). The use of *be* for *do* and vice versa (List 2. vi, vii) is due to an inadequate command of the English auxiliary system. The same applies to the use of modals instead of *do* (List 2. ix) as in *will not go* to mean *did not go*. The learners use inappropriate verb forms after modals such as *can doing*, *will not comes* because they have not acquired the restrictions on the use of modals.

The learners do not have NP-Aux inversion in question patterns (List 2. x) as a part of their grammar. It is a typical developmental error made by learners of English as a second language. The use of *what + statement* (List 2. xi) is due to the influence of Hindi question patterns. It may be pointed out that those students who get their NP-Aux inversion correct in questions made the error of retaining it in reported questions. Those who did not have NP-Aux inversion in their question patterns did not make this error.

The main source of difficulty in the auxiliary system is the use of *do*, which is either omitted from questions and negatives or used inappropriately.

Another major problem is NP-Aux inversion in questions. The following general rules have to be established :

1. *To form questions, the question word (if there is one) must be followed by the first auxiliary in front of the subject.*⁸
2. *Do appears in questions and negatives when there is no other auxiliary present.*
3. *In negatives, do or any other auxiliary is followed by not, often contracted to n't.*

To repair the progressive forms produced by the students the following rule will be useful :

To put a verb in the progressive tense, an appropriate form of be must be used in front of the main verb to which -ing is attached.

The passive rule also needs reinforcement :

A passive sentence must have an appropriate form of be followed by the -en form of the main verb.

An erroneous utterance like

Our team defeated in the semi-finals (List 2. iii)
must be corrected to
Our team was defeated in the semi-finals.

As an auxiliary, *have* is followed by the *-en* form of the main verb to make the perfective tense. *Be* cannot be used to form the perfective tense ; utterances such as

He was studied many books (List 2. i)
must be repaired to
He has studied many books.

Modal auxiliaries like *can, could, will, would, shall, should, may, might* are mutually exclusive with *do*. They can be followed by the uninflected form of the main verb, *have* or *be*.

(iii) Errors in Tense Usage

As many as 505 deviations have been recorded in this category (List 3). A major problem here is lack of inter-clause and inter-sentence tense concord. The confusion of the simple present and the simple past accounts for a large proportion of errors (List 3. i, ii). The continuous and the simple, the simple past and the past perfect, the simple past and the present perfect, the continuous and the perfect continuous, the present perfect and the simple present and the future and the simple present are also confused. In addition,

there are instances of marking the tense both in the auxiliary and the main verb.

Duskova (1969) suggests that the use of the present tense instead of the past is a mistake in performance. But in Selinker's (1972) view it is the result of a tendency to avoid grammatical formatives—a simplification strategy. Children acquiring English as their mother tongue as well as learners of English as a second language have been observed to employ this strategy. It may also be viewed as learning the unmarked form before the marked one. Deviations in the opposite direction, i.e., the use of the past instead of the present may be due to hyper-correction.

The use of the progressive instead of the simple tense form is another trouble spot for the students. The learner comes to the generalization that the continuous form is the tense for telling stories and describing successions of events; some text-book materials based on the contrastive method of teaching the progressive and the simple seem to create this impression. Consequently, the learner is left "with a patchwork of unfruitful partial generalizations" (Ritchie, 1967: 129) when too much attention is paid to points of difference between the progressive and the simple at the cost of realistic English. As Richards (1971: 211) points out, "the usual tense for a sequence of events taking place 'at the moment' is the present tense, the continuous tense being used only when a single event is extracted from a sequence, the sequence itself being indicated by the present forms". The confusion of the perfect and the simple and the future and the simple are developmental errors, results of false concepts hypothesized. The use of the past perfect instead of the simple past may be due to negative transfer from the system of Hindi. In Hindi both the perfective and the indefinite forms can be used in situations where English permits only the indefinite:

<i>English</i>	<i>Hindi</i>
What did you do last evening?	kal shaam tumne kyaa kiya
*What had you done last evening?	(thaa)?
I saw a movie.	maine ek 'movie'
*I had seen a movie	dekhii (thii).

The use of the continuous instead of the perfect continuous is also on the analogy of Hindi tense system:

<i>English</i>	<i>Hindi</i>
You can't go now. It's raining.	tum ab baahar n thii jaa sakte. baarish ho rahii hai.

*English**Hindi*

It has been raining since morning.

subah se baarish ho rahii hai.

*It is raining since morning.

Again, the use of the present perfect for the simple past may also have its origin in the mother tongue :

*English**Hindi*

He *wrote* a letter to Ram yesterday.

usne raam ko *kal* patra likh diya

*He has written a letter to Ram

(*hai*).

yesterday.

Deviations such as *he use to teach* for *he teaches* (List 3. xi) are a result of the learner associating *used to* with a past habit and by a false analogy arriving at the un-English expression *use to*, to mean a present habit. This is an interesting illustration of how learner systems are deduced from a limited exposure to the target language. Even in referring to past habit the learners fail to observe the restrictions on *used to* (List 3. xii).

Inability to maintain inter-sentence and inter-clause continuity is a systematic error observed in the performance of learners with various first language backgrounds. It is a developmental error caused by inadequate control of the rules required to produce acceptable utterances in a discourse situation.

In tense usage, the students need to acquire the distinction between the use of the present simple and the past simple. They must learn to use the simple present in appropriate contexts: to express a general truth, or a repeated or customary act or state. It is a sort of timeless tense, because it usually includes past, present and future time :

1. We usually go to Simla in the summer.
2. Do you play cricket ?
3. I go to college at 10 every day.
4. He works in the City Hospital.
5. The sun rises in the east.

Students can learn to associate it with adverbs of frequency such as *always*, *usually*, *often* and also with words like *whenever*. It is used to express a state or condition with verbs such as *agree*, *belong*, *have* (= possess), *love*, *remember*, *own* and so on.

The simple past must be used to express completed action which occurred at a specified time in the past. It is generally accompanied by a word, phrase or clause denoting that time in the past. It is used to express a series of past actions in narratives.

1. Raju arrived at 10 o'clock last night.
2. We lived in Indore 10 years ago.
3. I met him yesterday.
4. I got up this morning at seven, dressed, ate breakfast and went to work.

The simple past and the simple present are the two tenses which are used very frequently in everyday English. It is therefore necessary for the student to have a command of their usage.

As against the simple, the progressive tense is used to express actions which may be temporary. The progressive present can take expressions like *right now, for the time being, at the present moment*.

1. Don't disturb Rani. She is reading a book
(at the present moment).
2. Shyam is writing a letter (right now).
He started writing it a few minutes ago.

The past continuous is used to emphasize the duration of time and to express an action taking place when another action happened. The word *while* or *when* is usually associated with it.

1. While I was reading, somebody must have come in.
2. When the guests arrived, she was sweeping the floor.

The distinction between the perfect and the simple tenses is also confused by the students. They must learn not to use the present perfect with adverbials of past time such as *yesterday, last year, a week ago, last winter* and so on. These expressions go with the simple past.

The past perfect tense is used to express an action (a) which occurred or was completed before another action in the past or (b) which continued up to another time in the past.

1. When you came in, I thought I had met you in Calcutta in 1973.
2. She supposed that her teacher had kept a record of her attendance.

With words like *after* and *before* the simple past is often employed instead of the past perfect.

1. After he finished the book he gave it to me.
2. The teacher left the classroom before the bell rang.

Another distinction that the present students must acquire is between the use of the present progressive and the present perfect progressive. The perfect progressive must be used to express an action which began in the past and has continued up to and into the present :

1. The children started playing two hours ago.
2. They are still playing.
- 1 + 2 = 3. The children have been playing for two hours.

It is not correct to say :

- *4. The children are playing for two hours.

The auxiliary *used to* has the implication of past custom or habit that no longer exists now. *Used to* places greater emphasis on idea of past custom than do the two other means of indicating this kind of time :

When I was young I $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{used to play} \\ \text{played} \\ \text{would play} \end{array} \right\}$ cricket.

In narratives it is the simple past which is more commonly used. The un-English expression *use to* cannot be employed to refer to a present habit on the analogy of *used to*. The students who employ *use to* to mean a present habit must be helped to get rid of it and use the simple present instead.

The foregoing discussion gives us an insight into some of the systems and sub-systems of the learners' mini-grammar operating at a particular stage of development. In addition, this analysis makes clear just what it is that the students do not know, about the structure of English in the areas studied or what rules they must internalize, or be in active command of, in order to avoid these errors. Some of the major areas of deviations in student compositions have been highlighted. Each of these deviations can serve as a point of departure for teachers to construct remedial materials and plan teaching strategies along the lines of the grammatical points discussed in pedagogical notes. The results are significant for the course designer and the text-book writer as well. Any attempt to write a pedagogical grammar could benefit from the results of this analysis. What remains to be done is to prepare remedial teaching materials along the lines suggested. It is hoped that these findings will be useful to researchers working in this area in the future, and in designing teaching and testing materials.

Research Fellow

Dept. of Linguistics & Contemporary English

CIEFL, Hyderabad 500 007.

APPENDIX

List 1

Errors in Verb Forms and Patterns

- (i) **Is / am / are + verb stem (+ -s) for verb stem (+ -s) to mean simple present**
- They *are go* to school together.
 He *is live* in Ujjain.
 She *is come* to my house daily.
 My friend *is wear* simple dress.
 I am also *play* cricket.
 Students *are come* for study to our city.
 He *is never make* a noise in the classroom.
- (ii) **Was/were + verb stem + -ed for verb stem + -ed to mean simple past**
- He *was lived* in Zumritallaya.
 I *was went* to my village.
 People *were came* to meet my father.
 He *was passed* the examination.
 I *was went*.
 We *were took* our dinner...
- (iii) **Was/were + verb stem for verb stem + -ed to mean simple past**
- I *was go* to see the Taj.
 He *was live* at Ujjain two years before.
 Yes I *was go*.
 She *was asked* me....
- (iv) **Is/am/are + verb stem + -ed for verb stem (+ -s) to mean simple present**
- Suresh *is helped* of the poor.
 I *am helped* my uncle.
- (v) **Be + Verb stem + -en for Verb stem + -ed to mean simple past**
- I *am also got* Diwali vacation.
 In Kanpur our group *was seen* IIT.
 All day we *are travelled* in the car...
- (vi) **Verb stem + -ed or -en for infinitive forms**
- I *decided to spent* the vacation...
 We *go to well to took* bath.
 They *came to seen* us.

(vii) *Verb stem + -ing for infinitive forms*

They gave me permission *to going*.
 I like *to seeing* old movies.

(viii) *Verb stem or Verb stem + -ed or to + Verb stem for verb stem + -ing*

Before *see* the principal...
 She is interested in *sing*.
 Before *reached* the city he died.
 After *reached* home....
 After (to) *see* the Taj....

(ix) *Verb stem for -ed or en forms*

I got *thrill*.
 It was *build* by Shah Jahan.
 The train *arrive* to the platform.
 I have not *go* anywhere.
 The car which was *buy* by my father...
 Yesterday we *eat* dinner together.

(x) *Verb stem + -en for Verb stem + -ed*

They *given* me permission to go.
 He *done* no work.
 Yes I *gone*.
 She *shown* me the purse which you *given* her.

(xi) *Irregular verbs regularised*

She *breaked* her promise...
 ...Suresh *speaked*.
 Ramesh *drinked* coffee and I *drinked* tea.
 We *buved* sweets.

(xii) *Verb stem + -ing for Verb stem + -en*

My friend is *interesting* in games.

(xiii) *Questions reported with that-complementizer*

I asked her *that* she went to picnic with Ramesh.
 She asked me *that* why you did not go to college.

(xiv) *Question pattern retained in reported questions*

I do not know when *will he come*.
 She asked me why *did you not come*.
 I asked her that why *didn't you go* to picnic...
 I asked her (that) *did you go* to picnic...

List 2

Errors in the use of Auxiliary Verbs

(i) **Be** for **have to** form the perfect tense

He *was studied* many books.

He *was collected* many tickets.

... the car my father *was* recently *purchased*.

(ii) **Be** missing from continuous forms

He *reading* in Engineering College.

I *also collecting* tickets.

Why you *not telling* the truth?

(iii) **Be** missing from passive forms

... how shoes and chappals *makes*.

I *bore* such movies.

Our team *defeated* in the semi-finals.

(iv) **Double Auxiliaries** (mutually exclusive items)

They *are do not* study at home.

I *am don't* like him.

He *is do not* going.

... why *was you did not* go to college.

why you *are do not* tell the truth?

(v) **Do** missing from negatives and questions

He *not write* me letters.

Yes *not went*.

Where you *go* yesterday?

(vi) **Be** for **do** in negatives and questions

Now my friend *is not live* in Ujjain.

Yes I *was not went*.

Why you *are not tell* the truth?

(vii) **Do** for **be**

He *don't afraid of* anything.

He *did not able* to walk.

(viii) **Redundant do** in reported questions

I asked her *did you go* to picnic.

(ix) *Difficult / with modals*

He *can* doing anything for me.
 They *will* (*not*) *comes* to my house.
 I *am* *couldn't* *went* (to mean didn't go).
 I *will* *not* *go* (to mean didn't go).

(x) *No NP-Aux. inversion in questions*

Where you went yesterday?
 Why you do not tell the truth?

(xi) *Wh-word + statement for NP-Aux. inversion in questions*

What you went to picnic yesterday?

List 3

Errors in the use of Tenses

(i) *Simple present for simple past*

On the day of Diwali we got up early... We *take* bath... then
 we *go* bazaar ... there *are* boys and girls ...
 Last year I and Ajay *visit* Bombay ... we *live* there for
 15 days.
 Don't you *go* to picnic yesterday ... ?
 Where you *go* yesterday ... ?

(ii) *Simple past for simple present*

My friend is 16 years old. He *was* a good boy. He *was*
 intelligent. He *had* a shop. He *spent* every Sunday with
 me. We *go* to movies together ...
 Why you *did* not tell the truth? (for why don't you ...)

(iii) *Present continuous for simple present*

I *am* not *having* too much friends.
 I *am* *living* in Mandsaur.
 Why you *are* not *telling* truth?

(iv) *Past/Present continuous for simple past*

My father *was* *living* in Ujjain for 3 years.
 We went to Kanpur where we *are* *enjoying* and *seeing* ...
 Are you *going* to picnic yesterday?
 Yes I *was* *going*.

(v) *Present perfect for simple present*

(I get up early.) *I have gone* for a walk. Then *I have taken* a bath...I go to college with my friend ...

(vi) *Past perfect for simple past*

In the vacation *I had enjoyed* very much.
Where *had you gone* yesterday? *I had not gone* anywhere.
Then Ramesh *had taken* coffee and *I had taken* tea.

(vii) *Future for present simple*

He *will not do* his homework and *speaks* untrue.
They *will not come* at my house.

(viii) *Progressive for perfect progressive*

From that time Indians *are doing* Diwali.
He *is getting* no money for 6 months.

(ix) *Present perfect for simple past*

They *have gone* there last Sunday.
Where *have you gone* yesterday?
I have not gone anywhere.

(x) *Tense marked in Aux and main verb*

I did not went with the tour.
I did not saw that film.
Why *didn't you told* the truth?

(xi) *Use to to mean a present habit*

I use to roam with my friend ...
Now he *use to teach* boys ...
... *use to plan* for picnic ... *use to play* games.

(xii) *Used to for simple past*

I used to go to bed by 11 o'clock.

Notes

1. This is a revised and abridged version of Chapter 3 of my M.Litt. dissertation (Parasher, 1977). I am extremely grateful to Professor S. K. Verma under whose supervision I carried out this research.
2. CA can, however, be usefully employed to explain some of the errors made by the learner.

3. For a more detailed discussion of current trends in error analysis see Parasher (forthcoming).
4. A full account of the research work appeared in Parasher (1977).
5. I am grateful to Mr. R.K. Tongue and Mr. A.D. Moller who helped me decide all the doubtful and borderline cases of English usage.
6. These examples refer to four sub-categories described in List 1. i, ii, iii and iv.
7. Variant forms such as *with a view to celebrating* and *looking forward to seeing you* can wait until this rule gets established.
8. In modern grammatical analysis, tense is considered to be the first obligatory element of the auxiliary system. However, the rules given here work in teaching undergraduates.

References

- Burt, M.K. and Kiparsky, C. (1972). *The Gooficon: A Repair Manual for English*, Rowley: Newbury House.
- Dale, P.S. (1972). *Language Development*, Hinsdale: The Dryden Press Inc.
- Duskova, L. (1969). "On Sources of Errors in Foreign Language Learning", *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, 7-1, pp. 11-36.
- Jain, M.P. (1974). "Error Analysis: Source, Cause and Significance", in J.C. Richards ed. (1974). *Error Analysis: Perspectives in Second Language Acquisition*, London: Longman.
- Mackey, W. F. (1966). "Applied Linguistics: Its Meaning and Use", *ELT Journal*, 20.3, pp. 197-206.
- Nemser, W. (1971). "Approximative Systems of Foreign Language Learners", *IRAL*, 9.2, pp. 115-123.
- Palmer, H.E. (1917). *The Scientific Study and Teaching of Languages*, London: Oxford University Press.
- Parasher, S.V. (1977). *Errors in English Made by a Group of Hindi-speaking First Year Students of Madhya Pradesh: A Study in Applied Linguistics*, unpublished M. Litt. dissertation, Hyderabad: Central Institute of English and Foreign Languages.
- (forthcoming). "Current Trends in Error Analysis", *JSL*.
- Richards, J.C. (1971). "Non-Contrastive Approach to Error Analysis", *ELT Journal*, 25.3, pp. 204-219.
- Ritchie, W.C. (1967). "Some Implications of Generative Grammar for the Construction of Courses in English as a Foreign Language", *Language Learning*, 2, 1-2, 3-4, pp. 45-69, 111-31.
- Selinker, L. (1972). "Interlanguage", *IRAL*, 10.3, pp. 219-231.
- Stenson, N. (1975). "Induced Errors" in J. Schumann and N. Stenson eds. (1975), *New Frontiers in Second Language Learning*, Rowley: Newbury House.